UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/851,404	05/08/2001	Gregory C. Schohn	042933/274317	1878

826   7590   01/16/2008

ALSTON & BIRD LLP
BANK OF AMERICA PLAZA
101 SOUTH TRYON STREET, SUITE 4000
CHARLOTTE, NC 28280-4000

EXAMINER
BLACKWELL, JAMES H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/16/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/851,404	SCHOHN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	James H. Blackwell	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *13 March 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-17 and 19-55* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-17 and 19-55* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *28 May 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This Office Action is in response to an amendment filed 03/13/2007.

2.   It is noted that a Petition to revive a previous abandonment under 37 CFR

1.137(b) was granted 05/02/2007. The Examiner's delay in responding to the previous

Office Action was due to a technical problem that was resolved 10/29/2007.

3.   The filing date is **05/08/2001**.

4.   Claims 1-17, and 19-55 remain pending with this amendment.

5.   Claims 1, 36, 38, 41-42, and 53 are independent claims.

Claim Objections

6.   Claim 10 is objected to because of the following informalities:

       Claim 10 recites *"the order in which the respective portions of the content*

are to be presented includes a two-dimensional layout."

       The phrase *"respective portions"* is vague and unclear because it is not

known if it refers to the initially received content in an initial order, or the

processed content in a different order. Clarification is required.

7.   Claim 15 is objected to because of the following informalities:

       Claim 15 recites "*The method of claim 1 in which the reorganization*

information includes a hyperlink to be displayed near the beginning of the

document, the hyperlink pointing to a portion of the content that appears

later in the original order."

The phrase *"appears later in the original order"* appears to suggest that not all of the content of the original document is reordered? However, Claim 1 seems to suggest that all of the content in the original document is reordered (see limitation 1, claim 1; i.e., respective portions of content, suggests all of the content). Clarification is required.

8.   Claim 17 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 17 recites *"The method of claim 1, in which the reorganization information causes an automatic redirection from the first portion of the content to a later portion of the content when the document is opened for presentation."*

The phrase *"automatic redirection"* is vague and not further defined in the Specification. Clarification is required.

9.   Claim 22 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 22 recites *"The method of claim 1 in which analyzing includes identifying one of the portions as containing central content of the document."*

The phrase *"central content"* is vague as it begs the question, central to what? The word "central" can also be suggestive of a main point or summary as in "what is the central point of the paragraph." Clarification is required.

10.   Claim 34 is objected to because of the following informalities:

> Claim 34 recites *"The method of claim 1 in which the analyzing includes*
>
> *blocking major regions of the document."*
>
> The term "blocking" is vague as it could refer to deleting or omitting major
>
> regions of the document or it could refer to some sort of grouping major
>
> regions into blocks. Clarification is required.

11.   Claim 37 is objected to because of the following informalities:

> Claim 37 should be rewritten to read:

37.   (Currently Amended) The method of claim 36 also including

> receiving other requests for portions of the content of the document
>
> ~~different portions~~, and in response to the requests, returning other portions
>
> of the content using the reorganization information.
>
> because the current wording is confusing.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

12.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of
matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the
conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 41, 49 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed

invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 41 recites an apparatus and "means for" steps. However, none of the

"means for" steps clearly recite any hardware, nor does the Specification indicate that

any of these "means" includes a computer hardware component. Thus, the "means for"

elements recited in the claim merely comprise computer software components. Thus,

the recited invention is software *per se*. Accordingly, the claim fails to recite statutory

subject matter, as defined in 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claims 49 and 50 depend upon Claim 41 and recite additional features of the

software components. Accordingly, Claims 49 and 50 also fail to recite statutory subject

matter, as defined in 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

13.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by
> another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent
> granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the
> applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section
> 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States
> only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2)
> of such treaty in the English language.

14.   Claims 1-3, 7-17, 19-20, 22-25, 29-47, and 49-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

102(e) as being anticipated by Wyler (U.S. Patent No. 7,047,033 filed 01/31/2001,

published 05/16/2006).

In regard to independent Claim 1, Wyler discloses:

- *receiving an electronic document represented by serial data that contains*

  content of the document and defines an order in which respective portions of

  the content are to be presented on a display for viewing (at least Col. 1, line

54 through Col. 2, line 40; Col. 27, line 16 through Col. 28, line 50 →

describes a method for processing information received by a wireless device

over a computer network from at least one source of information (e.g.,

markup languages such as HTML, Rich Text Format, Scripts; see Col. 11,

line 38 through Col. 12, line 29), parsing at least some of the information and

employing at least some results of the parsing to provide the information in a

form suitable for display to a user on the wireless device. Markup language

sources of content, such as HTML markup, were known by those of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of invention to typically contain markup tags which at

least in part, implicitly *defined an ordering* of the content. When displayed,

such content would visually appear in an order at least in part according to

the tagging. Thus, <u>Wyler</u> teaches serial data received with a defined *initial*

ordering of the content).

- *analyzing the serial data of the electronic document by at least one*

  transformation module to determine an order of presentation of the portions of

  the content <u>different</u> from the order defined by the serial data (at least Col. 11,

  line 38 through Col. 12, line 29; Col. 14, line 59 through Col. 17, line 40; Col.

  27, line 16 through Col. 28, line 50 → content from any web-site, in any initial

  format or layout is parsed, analyzed (filtered), and converted to an

  intermediate scripting language. The scripting language conversion creates

  objects for each of the identified components of the received web page and

  allows for easier manipulation of the contents. Once analyzed and converted

to objects, each of the objects are given a weight according to rules governing where the content object is located both physically on the page, and logically within the page structure. Once the content objects are weighted, they can be reconstructed, for example, into a book style document, which through various means acts to <u>reorder</u> or otherwise change (i.e., add or remove) the content according to the style of document that the content is being mapped into (see Col. 17, line 41 through Col. 22, line 6).

One goal of converting to an intermediate scripting language, creating objects, and reconstructing a document in this way is to generate output capable of being displayed and used on devices with lesser capabilities, for example, in terms of screen size (see Col. 29, line 61 through Col. 30, line 12 particularly item b. stating, *"the order in which information is displayed may be changed e.g. such that important contexts precede less important contexts."*).

Thus, <u>Wyler</u> also teaches:

o *the different order of presentation being adapted based upon a performance capability of a display of a target device* (e.g. screen size of wireless device; see Col. 12, lines 32-37).

<u>Wyler</u> further discloses:

• *generating reorganization information for use in delivering the portions of the content, the reorganization information enabling presentation of the portions in the different order* (Col. 16, line 36 through Col. 17, line 40; Col. 17, line 44 through at least Col. 19, line 38 → content can be reordered according to its

importance established by assigned weights. During reconstruction, a new

document is created and content is placed according to its importance

governed by weights assigned to each content component).

In regard to independent Claim 36, <u>Wyler</u> discloses:

- *A method comprising at a server* (at least Col. 2, lines 33-40; Figs. 18A-C →

  generally, Wyler's invention uses an intermediate server that interconnects the

  source of requested content with the wireless device. Either some or all of the

  processing that converts the original source content to forms suitable for the

  wireless device takes place on the intermediate server),

  o *receiving a request from a remote device for a portion of a document*

    represented by serial data that contains content of the document and

    defines an order in which respective portions of the content are to be

    presented on a display for viewing (at least Col. 1, line 54 through Col. 2,

    line 40; Col. 27, line 16 through Col. 28, line 50 → describes a method for

    processing information received by a wireless device over a computer

    network from at least one source of information (e.g., markup languages

    such as HTML, Rich Text Format, Scripts; see Col. 11, line 38 through

    Col. 12, line 29), parsing at least some of the information and employing at

    least some results of the parsing to provide the information in a form

    suitable for display to a user on the wireless device. Markup language

sources of content, such as HTML markup, were known by those of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to typically contain markup

tags which at least in part, implicitly *defined an ordering* of the content.

When displayed, such content would visually appear in an order at least in

part according to the tagging. Thus, Wyler teaches serial data received

with a defined *initial ordering of the content*),

o   *in response to the request, analyzing the serial data of the electronic*

document by at least one transformation module to determine an order of

presentation of the portions of the content different from the order defined

by the serial data (at least Col. 11, line 38 through Col. 12, line 29; Col.

14, line 59 through Col. 17, line 40; Col. 27, line 16 through Col. 28, line

50 → content from any web-site, in any initial format or layout is parsed,

analyzed (filtered), and converted to an intermediate scripting language.

The scripting language conversion creates objects for each of the

identified components of the received web page and allows for easier

manipulation of the contents. Once analyzed and converted to objects,

each of the objects are given a weight according to rules governing where

the content object is located both physically on the page, and logically

within the page structure. Once the content objects are weighted, they can

be reconstructed, for example, into a book style document, which through

various means acts to reorder or otherwise change (i.e., add or remove)

the content according to the style of document that the content is being
mapped into (see Col. 17, line 41 through Col. 22, line 6).

One goal of converting to an intermediate scripting language,
creating objects, and reconstructing a document in this way is to generate
output capable of being displayed and used on devices with lesser
capabilities, for example, in terms of screen size (see Col. 29, line 61
through Col. 30, line 12 particularly item b. stating, *"the order in which
information is displayed may be changed e.g. such that important contexts
precede less important contexts."*).

Thus, Wyler also teaches:

- *the different order of presentation being adapted based upon a
  performance capability of a display of a target device* (e.g. screen
  size of wireless device; see Col. 12, lines 32-37).

o *returning at least one and fewer than all of the portions of the content
using reorganization information that enables presentation of the portions
in an-the different order* (as part of the conversion of the source document
into M2O (intermediate) Script Language (2nd Level), Wyler's application
removes irrelevant information (images and data i.e. advertising banners,
links to unrelated issues) from the source document (webpage)). Thus,
Wyler can create a new document that has less than the original
document content-wise and return the document to the target device.

Additionally <u>Wyler</u> discloses ... *using reorganization information*

that enables presentation of the portions in an-the different order (Col. 16,

line 36 through Col. 17, line 40; Col. 17, line 44 through at least Col. 19,

line 38 → content can be reordered according to its importance

established by assigned weights During reconstruction, a new document

is created and content is placed according to its importance governed by

weights assigned to each content component).

Thus, <u>Wyler</u> can remove "undesirable" content; reorder the

remaining original content according to how important the content is

governed by weights assigned to the content components.

In regard to Claim 38, Claim 38 merely recites a data structure stored on

a medium and capable of configuring a machine to respond to requests from the

method of Claim 1. Thus, <u>Wyler</u> discloses every limitation of Claim 38, as

indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1.

In regard to Claim 41, Claim 41 merely recites an apparatus for carrying

out the method of Claim 1. Thus, <u>Wyler</u> discloses every limitation of Claim 41, as

indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1.

In regard to Claim 42, Claim 42 merely recites an apparatus (machine) for carrying out the method of Claim 1. Thus, <u>Wyler</u> discloses every limitation of Claim 42, as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1.

In regard to Claim 53, Claim 53 merely recites an apparatus (display) for carrying out the method of Claim 1. Thus, <u>Wyler</u> discloses every limitation of Claim 53, as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1.

In regard to dependent Claim 2, <u>Wyler</u> discloses:

- *the serial data representing the electronic document is expressed in a markup language* (at least Col. 11, lines 39-67 → web source page is scanned for markup languages (e.g., HTML, WML), scripting languages, rich text format, etc.; Col. 14, line 60 through Col. 16, line 34 → discusses processing that typically would occur to document components associated with a markup language (links, images, tables, etc.)).

In regard to dependent Claim 3, <u>Wyler</u> discloses:

- *the markup language comprises a hypertext markup language* (at least Col. 11, lines 39-67 → web source page is scanned for markup languages (e.g., HTML, WML)).

In regard to dependent Claim 7, <u>Wyler</u> discloses:

- *the hypertext markup language comprises HTML* (at least Col. 11, lines 39-67

  → web source page is scanned for markup languages (e.g., HTML, WML)).

In regard to dependent Claim 8, <u>Wyler</u> discloses:

- *the markup language comprises PDF, postscript, SGML, PowerPoint, rich text, or unformatted text* (at least Col. 11, lines 39-67 → web source page is scanned for markup languages (e.g., HTML, WML), scripting languages, <u>rich text format</u>, etc.).

In regard to dependent Claim 9, <u>Wyler</u> discloses:

- *the content of the document includes at least one of the following: text, images, tables, frames, and headings* (at least Col. 15, line 32 through Col. 16, line 33 → describes identification of document content components including links, text, images, and tables).

In regard to dependent Claim 10, <u>Wyler</u> discloses:

    Note: it is unclear as to whether the "respective portions" are referring to the initially received content in an initial order, or the processed content in a different order. For purposes of examination, the former is assumed.

- *the order in which the respective portions of the content are to be presented includes a two-dimensional layout* (Figs. 2, 28 → depict typical initially

received documents in an initial ordering that is two dimensional (i.e., content

laid out in both x and y positions on the display screen).

In regard to dependent Claim 11, Wyler discloses:

- *the reorganization information includes an identification of a relative*

    importance of the respective portions of the content Col. 16, line 36 through

    Col. 17, line 40; Col. 17, line 44 through at least Col. 19, line 38 → content

    can be reordered according to its importance established by assigned weights

    During reconstruction, a new document is created and content is placed

    according to its importance governed by weights assigned to each content

    component).

In regard to dependent Claim 12, Wyler discloses:

- *the reorganization information includes an identification of a main block of text*

    (Col. 12, lines 14-30 → the system takes advantage of how a typical web

    page's contents are laid out both physically on the page and logically by

    content by a designer (in regions) to assist in determining the various parts

    (e.g., main block of text) contained in the web page and to eventually convert

    those identified components into M2O scripting).

In regard to dependent Claim 13, Wyler discloses:

- *the analyzing includes finding an annotation inserted in the electronic document as a marker of the location of the main block of text* (Col. 12, lines 14-30 → the system takes advantage of how a typical web page's contents are laid out both physically on the page and logically by content by a designer (in regions) to assist in determining the various parts (e.g., main block of text) contained in the web page and to eventually convert those identified components into M2O scripting. Content is then plugged into a template according to the region defined for it. The defined regions act as *markers or annotations* indicating the various regions of content. In this way, the system can later identify the beginnings and endings of these regions and assign them to particular web page components and convert those components to M2O scripting).

In regard to dependent Claim 14, Wyler discloses:

- *the reorganization information associates a revised order for presentation with at least some of the portions of content* (Col. 16, line 36 through Col. 17 line 40 → describes how various components of a received web page are identified, converted to M2O script objects, and then assigned weights based on physical, logical location of the object in the page as well as its relationship to a base or main object. All of these weights are then evaluated and go into determining what the output document contains when constructed will look like and what it will and won't contain). Thus, Wyler, in creating a revised

document for a mobile device uses the weighting to determine the content

and layout of the document displayed on the mobile device.

In regard to dependent Claim 15, Wyler discloses:

Note: the phrase *"appears later in the original order"* appears to suggest

that not all of the content of the original document is reordered? However, Claim

1 seems to suggest that all of the content in the original document is reordered.

For purposes of examination, this claim is interpreted as generally describing

navigational hyperlinks that are typically added to assist with quickly locating

various reorganized/reordered components of the document created for the

mobile device.

- *the reorganization information includes a hyperlink to be displayed near the*

  beginning of the document, the hyperlink pointing to a portion of the content

  that appears later in the original order (Col. 32, line 23 through Col. 35, at

  least to line 28 → describes a method for formatting a small display to contain

  objects that are determined to be retained (e.g., by their importance, weight).

  Among these is the creation of navigational components (i.e., Navigation Bar,

  Link Cluster). Both of these navigational components assist the user in

  navigating the created web page on the mobile device (see also Figs. 25-28;

  a Link Cluster is shown in Fig. 25 "Home" "Archives", etc.).

In regard to dependent Claim 16, Wyler discloses:

Note: For purposes of examination, this claim is interpreted as generally describing aspects of navigational hyperlinks that are typically added to assist with quickly locating various reorganized/reordered components of the document created for the mobile device. Typically, hyperlinks are not added to link to content on the same viewable portion of the screen. Rather, they are added when the content they link to is not currently displayed.

• *the hyperlink is included only if the location of the hyperlink in the document is separated by at least a predetermined distance from the location to which it points* (Col. 32, line 23 through Col. 35, at least to line 28 → describes a method for formatting a small display to contain objects that are determined to be retained (e.g., by their importance, weight). Among these is the creation of navigational components (i.e., Navigation Bar, Link Cluster). Both of these navigational components assist the user in navigating the created web page on the mobile device (see also Figs. 25-28; a Link Cluster is shown in Fig. 25 "Home" "Archives", etc. The "Home" link would represent a link added to link back to the home page or top of the page which is currently not displayed in Fig. 25).

In regard to dependent Claim 17, Wyler fails to explicitly disclose:

Note: the phrase "automatic redirection" is vague and is not further defined in the Specification. For purposes of examination, this phrase will be interpreted broadly.

- *reorganization information causes an automatic redirection from the first portion of the content to a later portion of the content when the document is opened for presentation.*

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of web design at the time of invention to have added or inserted, for example, a HTML META command of the type <meta http-equiv="refresh" content="0; URL=http://<a relative link would go here"> to the reorganization information directing the new document created for the mobile device, providing the benefit of quickly directing the user of the mobile device to content deemed perhaps more important or critical or timely.

In regard to dependent Claim 19, <u>Wyler</u> discloses:

- *the different order of presentation enabled by the reorganization information is adapted for a display that has a more restricted performance capability than does the performance capability of the display for which the document was originally desired* (at least Col. 27, lines 29-38; Figs 18A-C → describes the process of receiving content originally from a web site designed with a desktop user in mind, and processing that content to generate a revised document <u>suitable for display</u> (i.e., adapted for a display that has a more restricted performance capability) on a wireless telephone, which would have had a more restricted performance capability than would a desktop computer).

In regard to dependent Claim 20, Wyler discloses:

- *the more restricted display is part of a mobile phone of personal digital assistant, and the display for which the document was originally designed comprises a desktop computer* (at least Col. 27, lines 29-38; Figs 18A-C → describes the process of receiving content originally from a web site designed with a desktop user in mind, and processing that content to generate a revised document <u>suitable for display</u> (i.e., adapted for a display that has a more restricted performance capability) on a wireless telephone, which would have had a more restricted performance capability than would a desktop computer).

In regard to dependent Claim 22, Wyler discloses:

Note: the phrase "central content" is vague as it begs the question, central to what? The word "central" can also be suggestive of a main point or summary as in "what is the central point of the paragraph."

- *analyzing includes identifying one of the portions as containing central content of the document* (at least Col. 23, line 12-18 → among the components of the originally received web page identified is the "Body Text" or the main text object).

In regard to dependent Claim 23, Wyler discloses:

- *generating includes inserting a link from near the beginning of the first portion of the content to the beginning of the central content portion* (Col. 32, line 23 through Col. 35, at least to line 28 → describes a method for formatting a small display to contain objects that are determined to be retained (e.g., by their importance, weight). Among these is the creation of navigational components (i.e., Navigation Bar, Link Cluster). Both of these navigational components assist the user in navigating the created web page on the mobile device (see also Figs. 25-28; a Link Cluster is shown in Fig. 25 "Home" "Archives", etc. The "Home" link, for example, would represent a link added to link back to the home page or top of the page which is currently not displayed in Fig. 25).

In regard to dependent Claim 24, <u>Wyler</u> discloses:

- *generating includes moving the central content portion to near the beginning of the document* (Col. 16, line 36 through Col. 17, line 40; Col. 17, line 44 through at least Col. 19, line 38 → content can be reordered according to its importance established by assigned weights During reconstruction, a new document is created and content is placed according to its importance governed by weights assigned to each content component. A "central content portion" would have typically been given a high weight by the system of <u>Wyler</u> and thus its final position in the document would have changed likely to the beginning of the document).

In regard to dependent Claim 25, <u>Wyler</u> discloses:

- *generating includes altering the document so that the central content portion appears first when the document is presented* (Col. 16, line 36 through Col. 17, line 40; Col. 17, line 44 through at least Col. 19, line 38 → content can be reordered according to its importance established by assigned weights During reconstruction, a new document is created and content is placed according to its importance governed by weights assigned to each content component. A "central content portion" would have typically been given a high weight by the system of <u>Wyler</u> and thus its final position in the document would have changed likely to the beginning of the document).

In regard to dependent Claim 29, <u>Wyler</u> discloses:

- *analyzing includes identifying portions of the document that should be moved relative to other portions in generating the reorganization information* (at least Col. 24, lines 15-41; Fig. 12 → represents a Book format style that the content components of the originally received web page, identified and converted to objects can be organized into. For the original component objects (not filtered out) to fit within the Book format style (i.e., template), many of the original component objects are necessarily relocated/reorganized to comply with the Book format style requirements. Wyler also assures that related content

remains connected (e.g., via Navigational bars, and hyperlinks which may

appear in locations different from the content they're directed to).

In regard to dependent Claim 30, <u>Wyler</u> discloses:

- *the portions that should be moved comprise images or tables* (Col. 16, line 36

  through Col. 17, line 40; Col. 17, line 44 through at least Col. 19, line 38 →

  content can be reordered/reorganized according to its importance established

  by assigned weights. Any images, tables, or any other sort of content that did

  not get filtered out as being irrelevant, could have been relocated/reordered in

  the construction of the new document where the specific content components

  are placed according to their importance governed by weights assigned to

  each content component such as images or tables.).

In regard to dependent Claim 31, <u>Wyler</u> discloses:

- *analyzing includes identifying regions according to functions* (at least Col. 21,

  line 60 through Col. 23, line 42 → depicts numerous content types, some of

  which perform specific functions such as advertising, linking, etc.).

In regard to dependent Claim 32, <u>Wyler</u> discloses:

- *the functions include navigation and content* (at least Col. 23, lines 13-25 →

  depicts numerous content types, including body text and navigation

  (hyperlinks)).

In regard to dependent Claim 33, <u>Wyler</u> discloses:

- *the analyzing includes converting the document to a tree format* (Col. 31,

  lines12-35, Figs. 28, 34-35 → depicts an example of an object tree generated

  by parsing the webpage of Fig. 28 (original page), except for the children of

  element 88 (Table), which themselves form an object tree and which are not

  illustrated in FIG. 34. The objects in the object tree are graded in step 1660,

  in order to assign a weight to each object in the tree. In step 1670, a decision

  is made by thresholding the weights determined in step 1660. Typically,

  different thresholds are used for different types of objects. For example, text

  objects may have a lower threshold than image objects. Generally, object

  types for which there is a high degree of confidence that their weights

  accurately reflect their importance are assigned a relatively high threshold.

  Conversely, object types for which there is a low degree of confidence that

  their weights accurately reflect their importance are assigned a relatively low

  threshold to prevent important information from being inadvertently

  discarded).

In regard to dependent Claim 34, <u>Wyler</u> discloses:

   Note: The term "blocking" is vague. For purposes of examination, the term

"blocking" is interpreted as leaving out or omitting from the final document.

- *the analyzing includes blocking major regions of the document* (at least Col. 22, line 7 through Col. 23, line 60 → depicts typical non-relevant content that is typically removed by the processing so that it is not included in the mobile document. Some of these may be interpreted as "major").

In regard to dependent Claim 35, <u>Wyler</u> discloses:

- *the analyzing includes counting characters of text* (Col. 31, lines 41-55 → describes that words are counted as a part of a "word matching" function which in turn is a part of the determination and weighting of text objects. Words contain characters).

In regard to dependent Claim 37, <u>Wyler</u> discloses:

- *receiving other requests for portions of the content of the document ~~different portions~~, and in response to the requests, returning other portions of the content using the reorganization information* (see Figs. 18A-C → each of these figures depicts different types of mobile devices capable of requesting content. The requested content for each of these different devices would be processed and an appropriate content would be then provided to each of these devices constructed according to an output style chosen and what fits on the screen of the device).

In regard to dependent Claim 39, <u>Wyler</u> discloses:

- *the data structure also includes the content, the data being expressed as a modified version of an original data structure that expressed the document* (at least Col. 11, line 41 through Col. 12, line 9 → <u>Wyler</u> generally discloses the steps of receiving an original web page, analyzing the web page to identify the various components, <u>which would include content</u>, converting that content to objects, determining which objects to keep and which ones to omit, and constructing a new document suitable for display on a mobile device such as a phone or PDA. In doing so, a new "data structure" in at least the form of a modified/reordered/reorganized mobile friendly document is generated comprising at least some of the original content).

In regard to dependent Claim 40, <u>Wyler</u> discloses:

- *the modified version of the data structure includes annotations* (at least Col. 24, lines 53 -67 → describes an auto detection of style selected for the output document content to be mapped into and includes the annotation of, for example, Date and Time, user information, etc.).

In regard to Claims 43-44, and 45, Claims 43-44, and 45 merely recite a data structure stored on a medium and capable of configuring a machine to respond to requests from the method of Claims 14-15, and 17, respectively. Thus, <u>Wyler</u> discloses every limitation of Claims 43-44, and 45, as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 14-15, and 17.

In regard to Claims 46, and 47, Claims 46 and 47 merely recite a data structure stored on a medium and capable of configuring a machine to respond to requests from the method of Claims 19, and 20, respectively. Thus, Wyler discloses every limitation of Claims 46 and 47, as indicated in the above rejection for Claims 19 and 20.

In regard to Claims 49, and 50, Claims 49, and 50 merely recite an apparatus for carrying out the method of Claims 19, and 20, respectively. Thus, Wyler discloses every limitation of Claims 49 and 50, as indicated in the above rejection for Claims 19, and 20.

In regard to Claims 51, and 52, Claims 51, and 52 merely recite an apparatus (machine) for carrying out the method of Claims 19, and 20, respectively. Thus, Wyler discloses every limitation of Claims 51, and 52, as indicated in the above rejection for Claims 19, and 20.

In regard to Claims 54, and 55, Claims 54, and 55 merely recite an apparatus (display) for carrying out the method of Claims 19, and 20, respectively. Thus, Wyler discloses every limitation of Claims 54, and 55, as indicated in the above rejection for Claims 19, and 20.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Wyler in view of Raghunandan (U.S. Patent No. 6,775,689 filed 06/07/2000, issued

08/10/2004).

In regard to dependent Claim 4, Wyler fails to explicitly disclose:

- *the serial data is in an email format.*

However, Raghunandan discloses *the serial data is in an email format* (see

Abstract → describes a method for restructuring email messages for transmission to

a plurality of recipients by providing transmission control directives and email content

segment identifiers supplied by the user, parsing the said directives and email

contents, expanding aliases wherever necessary and applying the said directives to

restructure the email contents and further including reordering selected identified

segments identified by a user in a defined sequence prior to transmission).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention to combine the disclosures of Wyler and Raghunandan since both

inventions are related to the restructure and reorder of content in various document

types. Adding the disclosure of Raghunandan provides the benefit of including

among those various document types email documents.

In regard to dependent Claim 5, <u>Wyler</u> fails to explicitly disclose:

- *the electronic mail format includes a header and a main body.*

However, <u>Raghunandan</u> discloses *the electronic mail format includes a header and a main body* (Col. 10, lines 15-61 → clearly shows the structure of an email including header and main body).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the disclosures of <u>Wyler</u> and <u>Raghunandan</u> since both inventions are related to the restructure and reorder of content in various document types. Adding the disclosure of <u>Raghunandan</u> provides the benefit of including among those various document types email documents.

In regard to dependent Claim 6, <u>Wyler</u> fails to disclose:

- *the analyzing includes determining the start of the main body.*

However, <u>Raghunandan</u> discloses *the analyzing includes determining the start of the main body* (Col. 6, lines 41-44 → the email system parses the said message to identify each segment as well as the list of recipients for each segment, as shown in block (1.2)). In doing so, <u>Raghunandan</u> would have identified the main body of the email.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention to combine the disclosures of Wyler and Raghunandan since both

inventions are related to the restructure and reorder of content in various document

types. Adding the disclosure of Raghunandan provides the benefit of including

among those various document types email documents.

16.   Claims 21 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Wyler in view of Ma et al. (hereinafter Ma, "A Framework for Adaptive Content

Delivery in Heterogeneous Network Environments", Copyright 01/2000).

In regard to dependent Claim 21, Wyler fails to disclose:

- *presentation of the portions of the content comprises presenting the portions*
  by speech synthesis.

However, Ma discloses *presentation of the portions of the content comprises*

presenting the portions by speech synthesis (Pg. 3, Sec. 3.2 → Ma discloses a

Modality Transform that includes speech-to-text and text-to-speech transform that

transforms content into speech for use on a mobile device).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention

to combine the disclosures of Wyler, and Ma as all both inventions are related to

modifying original content to be suitable for mobile devices. Adding the disclosure of

Ma provides the benefit of converting text content to speech to assist the vision-

impaired.

In regard to Claim 48, Claim 48 merely recites a data structure stored on a

medium and capable of configuring a machine to respond to requests from the

method of Claim 21. Thus, the combination of <u>Wyler</u> and <u>Ma</u> discloses every

limitation of Claim 48, as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 21.

17.   Claims 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Wyler in further view of Kanevsky (U.S. Patent No. 6,300,947 filed 07/06/1998, issued

10/09/2001).

In regard to dependent Claim 26, <u>Wyler</u> fails to explicitly disclose:

- *analyzing includes identifying portions of the document that should not be*
  separated in generating the reorganization information.

However, <u>Kanevsky</u> discloses *analyzing includes identifying portions of the*

document that should not be separated in generating the reorganization information

(at least Col. 11, lines 64-67; Col. 12, lines 1-12 → amongst the criteria for making

priority decisions in order to determine what and how to display web objects is how

the web objects depend from or are associated with each other).

In addition, <u>Kanevsky</u> discloses (Col. 14, lines 15-28 → that web objects that

contain or point to information with the same or similar topics are combined into one

set.

<u>Kanevsky</u> further discloses (Col. 14, lines 58-67 → a semantic interpreter module

that separates objects on web pages that refer to different topics and combines

(unifies) objects that refer to the same or similar subjects.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Wyler, and Kanevsky as both inventions relate to adapting content based on conditions. Adding the teaching of Kanevsky provides the benefit of fitting the content of a web page into a variety of display types and sizes.

In regard to dependent Claim 27, Wyler fails to explicitly disclose:

- *the portions that should not be separated include at least one of the following pairs: heading and text, image and caption,* or that *paragraph and related paragraph* ().

However, Kanevsky discloses *the portions that should not be separated include at least one of the following pairs: heading and text, image and caption,* or that *paragraph and related paragraph* (at least Col. 14, lines 15-57 → depicts numerous headings associated with links that direct the reader to the associated content (text)).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Wyler, and Kanevsky as both inventions relate to adapting content based on conditions. Adding the teaching of Kanevsky provides the benefit of fitting the content of a web page into a variety of display types and sizes.

In regard to dependent Claim 28, Wyler fails to explicitly disclose:

- *analyzing includes identifying portions of the document that should not be moved relative to other portions of the document.*

However, <u>Kanevsky</u> discloses *analyzing includes identifying portions of the document that should not be moved relative to other portions of the document* (at least Col. 15, lines 30-37 → describes a semantic interpreter module that may define what can be deleted or moved. Hence, it would have also determined *what could not be deleted or moved*).

In addition, <u>Kanevsky</u> discloses (Col. 14, lines 15-28 → that web objects that contain or point to information with the same or similar topics are combined into one set.

<u>Kanevsky</u> further discloses (Col. 14, lines 58-67 → a semantic interpreter module that separates objects on web pages that refer to different topics and combines (unifies) objects that refer to the same or similar subjects.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of <u>Wyler</u>, and <u>Kanevsky</u> as both inventions relate to adapting content based on conditions. Adding the teaching of <u>Kanevsky</u> provides the benefit of fitting the content of a web page into a variety of display types and sizes.

Response to Arguments

18.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claim1-3, 9-11, 14-17, 19-20, 22-25, 29-30,

34-47 and 49-55 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of

rejection.

Conclusion

19.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to James H. Blackwell whose telephone number is 571-

272-4089. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-4:30 M-F.

20.   If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached on 571-272-4137. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

21.   Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

James H. Blackwell
01/10/2008

/Doug Hutton/
Doug Hutton
Supervisory Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2100